

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application & Formalities**

**Claim Status**

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants are amending claims 2 & 13 and adding new claim 19.

**Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because the expulsion channel “5” allegedly is pointing to a wall and not the channel. Applicants are amending figures 2 and 3 to address the objection.

The drawings are objected to because they allegedly do not show a “set of spray head assemblies.” Applicants are submitting a new figure 5 to address the objection.

The drawings are objected to because they allegedly do not show the “end wall.” The end wall is shown in Figure 1. The specification states that “[t]he spray profile 10 is formed in the end wall of the spray head, and, in known manner, comprises preferably non-radial spray channels 11 leading into a central spray chamber 12 disposed directly upstream from said spray orifice 1.” (Current specification, page 4, lines 4-8.) Since the spray profile 10 is formed in the end wall, and the spray profile 10 is shown in figure 1, the end wall is also shown in figure 1.

**Specification**

The specification is objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. More specifically, the Examiner states that in Claim 2 the “at least one projection (30)” is not described in the specification as such and is disclosed as a “flat surface.” (*See* Office Action, page .) The specification, however, states that “said centering means comprise at least one projection, and preferably three, the diameter of the inscribed circle defined by said projections being substantially identical to the diameter of the insert.” (*See*

current specification, page 2, lines 23-26.) The specification also states that “[t]he flat surfaces could be replaced by different profiles such as convex or concave projections, e.g. circular arcs, or even by a plurality of lugs distributed around the channel.” (See original specification, page 5, lines 8-11.) In view of the above, Applicants submit that the term “projections” is adequately supported in the specification.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 13 is objected to because the word “channel” should follow the word “expulsion” in line 4. Applicant is amending claim 13 as suggested by the Examiner.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants are amending claim 2 to address the rejection.

**Summary of Art Rejections**

*1. Claims 1-4, 8 and 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Marelli et al (U. S. 5,224,471).*

*2. Claims 5-7 and 9, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Marelli et al (U. S. 5,224,471).*

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

*1. Claims 1-4, 8 and 10-18 over Marelli.*

Regarding independent claim 1 Marelli does not disclose at least “wherein said spray head comprises centering means for centering said insert (20), wherein said expulsion channel (5) includes said centering means for centering said insert (20), and in that said centering means are formed in the proximity of the spray profile (10).”

The wall portion 3 disclosed in Marelli (*see* Figure 3) is located at the cross-section taken on line 3-3 of figure 1. (*See* Marelli, col. 2, lines 51-53; FIGS. 1, 3.)

Figures 4, 5 & 6, which are cross-sectional views of lines 4-4, 5-5 & 6-6, respectively, of figure 1 of Marelli, show no centering means. Marelli clearly states that “[t]he round-section cylindrical portion 10 of the of the profiled element has a smaller cross-section than the cavity delimited by the tubular wall 2, so that between them an annular cylindrical space 12 is formed (FIG. 5) allowing free flow of the substance to be dispensed.” (Marelli, col. 3, lines 21-26.) As such, Marelli teaches away from forming any centering means in the proximity of a spray profile. Rather, Marelli teaches that the centering means shown on figure 3 are thus provided away from the spray profile, and not in the proximity of the spray profile, as recited in independent claim 1.

An exemplary advantage of having the centering means formed in the proximity of the spray profile ensures that the central axis of the insert is identical with the central axis of the spray chamber, thus avoiding the drawbacks mentioned in the description. (*See* current specification p. 1, lines 23-34.)

In Marelli, the centering means are far away from the spray profile and the pressure of the liquid during dispensing may deform the insert in the spray profile such that the insert contacts the wall, thereby creating a situation as schematically shown in figure 2 of the present application.

Nothing in Marelli indicates that centering means could also be provided in the proximity of the spray profile. In fact, Marelli teaches away from forming any centering means in the proximity of a spray profile to allow the free flow of substance to be dispensed. (Marelli, col. 3, lines 21-26.)

In view of the above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Marelli.

Claims 2-4 and 8-10, and 17 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 11, Marelli does not disclose at least “at least one radial projection extending from an inside wall of the expulsion channel and abutting the insert so as to substantially align the central axis of the insert with the central axis of the expulsion channel.”

Again, in Marelli the centering means are far away from the spray profile and the pressure of the liquid during dispensing may deform the insert in the spray profile such that the insert contacts the wall, thereby creating a situation as schematically shown in figure 2 of the present application.

Claims 12-16 and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 11.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

*2. Claims 5-7 and 9 over Marelli.*

Claims 5-7 and 9 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

**New Claims**

New claim 19 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/566,708

Attorney Docket No.: Q92887

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Raja N. Saliba  
Registration No. 43,078

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 5, 2009